



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,005	07/12/2005	Junya Kaku	050445	8929
23850 7590 11/12/2009 KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP 1420 K Street, N.W. Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER LIANG, VEH CHUNG	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/12/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: JUNYA KAKU

Application No. 10/542,005
Technology Center 2100

Mailed: November 12, 2009

Before DEBORAH L. PERRY *Supervisory Paralegal Specialist, Review Team.*

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on October 5, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

Section §1207.02 of the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) (Eighth Edition, Rev. 6, September 2007) states:

(A) CONTENT REQUIREMENTS FOR EXAMINER'S ANSWER. The examiner's answer is required to include, under appropriate headings, in the order indicated, the following items:

. . . .

- (8) Evidence Relied Upon. A listing of the evidence relied on (e.g., patents, publications, admitted prior art), and in the case of nonpatent references, the relevant page or pages.

The Examiner's Answer mailed May 12, 2009, is deficient because the "Evidence Relied Upon" section fails to include the reference(s) Hostettler US PGPub 2003/0192030 A1 cited in the Communication dated June 12, 2009, on page(s) 2 in the Examiner's Answer's grounds of rejection of Claims 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. US 6,795,097 B1 in view of Hostettler US PGPub 2003/0192030 A1.

Appropriate correction is required.

APPEAL BRIEF, SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellant filed an Appeal Brief dated October 9, 2008. The Appeal Brief is not in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c) effective September 13, 2004.

According to 37 CFR § 41.37(c) (v), an Appeal Brief must include the following:

(v) *Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter*. A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the and independent claims involved in the appeal, which must refer to the specification by page line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. < While reference to page and line number of the specification ~~**~~>requires< somewhat more detail than simply summarizing the invention, it is considered important to enable the Board to more quickly determine where the claimed subject matter is described in the application. >For each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately under the provisions of 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii), every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

The “Summary of claimed subject matter” appearing on pages 6-9 of the Appeal Brief filed October 9, 2008 is deficient because it does not separately map independent Claim 8 to the specification by line and page number. Correction is required.

MPEP § 1205.03 states in part:

(B) When the Office holds the brief to be defective solely due to appellant’s failure to provide a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v), an entire new brief need not, and should not, be filed. Rather, a paper providing a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) will suffice. Failure to timely respond to the Office’s requirement will

result in dismissal of the appeal. See MPEP § 1215.04 and § 711.02(b).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

- 1) to issue a PTO-90 citing the missing references listed under the Evidence Relied Upon section, paragraph (8); and
- 2) hold the Appeal Brief filed October 9, 2008, defective, as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(d);
- 3) notify the Appellant to submit a “paper” which corrects the Appeal Brief’s Summary of Claimed Subject Matter under 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v);
- 4) acknowledge and consider any “paper” submitted by Appellant to correct the Appeal Brief; and
- 5) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DP/dw

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP
1420 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON DC 20005